

compassionate Americans. It hits all the political hot buttons and it makes it seem as though human cloning is a great discovery in our day and age that will cure cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's disease and even keep our country safe from the terrorists by identifying the origins of germ and biological weapons.

However, creating cloned human embryos raises the real possibility that one day they will be implanted into a woman's uterus to create a human cloned baby. Over 95 percent of all animal clonings attempted end in failure; and, like Dolly the sheep, cloned animals have genetic abnormalities.

Most scientists agree that human cloning poses a serious risk of producing babies that are stillborn, unhealthy, and have severe malformations.

Let us not forget the ethical problems associated with human cloning. Cloning is entirely unsafe to practice on human beings because it poses serious risks to the developing cloned baby and to pregnant women due to genetic abnormalities. The attempts to perfect human cloning despite the high risk of injury would constitute a violation of the fundamental principles of all medical research to do no harm.

Research cloning will not only make reproductive cloning more likely, it is unethical. Regardless of what you think about the moral status of human embryos, human beings should not be created solely for research. Human cloning for research involves the creation of a human cloned embryo to be bought, sold and stripped, and exploited for its many parts.

□ 1745

Such proponents have crossed the ethical line universally adopted even by supporters of embryo stem cell research.

As always, in simplicity we find the truth. Human cloning, whether for research or reproduction, involves the creation of a new human life. We have reached a point in our Nation's history where arrogant scientists and medical researchers have become so emboldened with the race to become the first to genetically manipulate human life that they have set aside all standards of human decency, morality, and ethics. They rush to usher in a new era in which genetic alteration of human life is common place; and, therefore, they become the creators of human life. They become the idols of their peers.

I urge my colleagues to not allow such a gross violation of human dignity.

CONFIRMATION OF MIGUEL ESTRADA

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as of today there has not been a vote on the nomi-

nation of Miguel Estrada to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Article II, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution states that the President has the power to appoint judges with the advice and consent of the Senate, advice and consent. Those two little words represent the difference between an organized process of judicial nomination and sheer chaos.

President Bush first nominated Miguel Estrada on May 9, 2001, 18 months ago. For 18 long months, we have waited for the confirmation of Mr. Estrada. Time is running out. For the sake of the integrity of the nomination process, for the sake of decency and simple fairness, the process must move forward.

The American people sent us to Washington to get a job done, not to waste time. It is time to vote on Miguel Estrada. The American people do not want obstructionism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PORTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONSERVATIVES AGAINST A WAR WITH IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, most people do not realize how many conservatives are against going to war in Iraq.

A strong majority of nationally syndicated conservative columnists have come out against this war. Just three of the many, many examples I could give include the following:

Charlie Reese, a staunch conservative, who was elected a couple of years ago as the favorite columnist of C-SPAN viewers, wrote that a U.S. attack on Iraq "is a prescription for the decline and fall of the American empire."

Paul Craig Roberts, who was one of the highest-ranking Treasury Department officials under President Reagan and now a nationally syndicated conservative columnist, wrote: "An invasion of Iraq is likely the most thoughtless action in modern history."

James Webb, a hero of Vietnam and President Reagan's Secretary of the Navy, wrote: "The issue before us is not whether the United States should end the regime of Saddam Hussein, but whether we as a Nation are prepared to occupy territory in the Middle East for the next 30 to 50 years."

It is a traditional conservative position, Mr. Speaker, to be against huge deficit spending.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that a very short war, followed by a 5-year occupation of Iraq, would

cost the U.S. \$272 billion, this on top of an estimated \$350 billion deficit for the coming fiscal year.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against the U.S. being the policeman of the world. That is exactly what we will be doing if we go to war in Iraq.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against world government, because conservatives believe that government is less wasteful and arrogant when it is small and closer to the people.

It is a traditional conservative position to be critical of, skeptical about, or even opposed to the very wasteful, corrupt United Nations; yet the primary justification for this war, what we hear over and over again, is that Iraq has violated 16 U.N. resolutions. Well, other nations have violated U.N. resolutions; yet we have not threatened war against them.

It is a traditional conservative position to believe it is unfair to U.S. taxpayers and our military to put almost the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on the U.S.; yet that is exactly what will happen in a war against Iraq. In fact, it is already happening, because even if Hussein backs down now, it will have cost us billions of dollars in war preparations and moving so many of our troops, planes, ships and equipment to the Middle East.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against huge foreign aid, which has been almost a complete failure for many years now. Talk about huge foreign aid, Turkey, according to reports, is demanding 26 to \$32 billion; Israel wants 12 to \$15 billion; Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia want additional aid in unspecified amounts.

Almost every country that is supporting the U.S. in this war wants something in return. The cost of all these requests have not been added in to most of the war costs calculations. All this to fight a bad man who has a total military budget of about \$1.4 billion, less than three-tenths of 1 percent of ours.

The White House said Hussein has less than 40 percent of the weaponry and manpower that he had at the time of the first Gulf War. One analyst estimated only about 20 percent.

His troops surrendered then to camera crews or even in one case to an empty tank. Hussein has been weakened further by years of bombing and economic sanctions and embargoes. He is an evil man, but he is no threat to us; and if this war comes about, it will probably be one of the shortest and certainly one of the most lopsided wars in history.

Our own CIA put out a report just a few days before our war resolution vote saying that Hussein was so weak economically and militarily he was really not capable of attacking anyone unless forced into it. He really controls very little outside the city of Baghdad.

The Washington Post 2 days ago had a column which said, "The war in Iraq,

likely in the next few weeks, is not expected to last long, given the overwhelming U.S. fire power to be arrayed against the Iraqis. But the trickier job may be in the aftermath."

Fortune Magazine said, "Iraq, we win. What then? A military victory could turn into a strategic defeat . . . a prolonged, expensive, American-led occupation . . . could turn U.S. troops into sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists . . . All of that could have immediate and negative consequences for the global economy."

Not only have most conservative columnists come out strongly against this war, but also at least four conservative magazines and two conservative think tanks.

One conservative Republican member of the other body said last week that the "rush to war in Iraq could backfire" and asked, "We are wrecking coalitions, relationships and alliances so we can get a 2-week start on going to war alone?"

The Atlantic Monthly magazine said we would spend so much money in Iraq we might as well make it the 51st State. I believe most conservatives would rather that money be spent here.

It is a traditional conservative position to be in favor of a strong national defense, not one that turns our soldiers into international social workers, and to believe in a noninterventionist foreign policy, rather than in globalism or internationalism. We should be friends with all nations, but we will weaken our own Nation, maybe irreversibly, unless we follow the more humble foreign policy the President advocated in his campaign.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is very much against every conservative tradition to support preemptive war. Another member of the other body, the Senator from West Virginia, not a conservative but certainly one with great knowledge of and respect for history and tradition, said recently, "This is no simple attempt to defang a villain. No. This upcoming battle, if it materializes, represents a turning point in U.S. foreign policy and possibly a turning point in the recent history of the world."

Mr. Speaker, I would insert at this point my full statement in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, most people do not realize how many conservatives are against going to war in Iraq.

A strong majority of nationally-syndicated conservative columnists have come out against this war. Just three of many examples I could give include the following:

Charley Reese, a staunch conservative, who was selected a couple of years ago as the favorite columnist of C-Span viewers, wrote that a U.S. attack on Iraq: "is a prescription for the decline and fall of the American empire. Overextension—urged on by a bunch of rabid intellectuals who wouldn't know one end of a gun from another—has doomed many an empire. Just let the United States try to occupy the Middle East, which will be the practical result of a war against Iraq, and Americans will be bleed dry by the costs in both blood and treasure."

Paul Craig Roberts, who was one of the highest-ranking Treasury Department officials under President Reagan and now a nationally-syndicated conservative columnist, wrote: "an invasion of Iraq is likely the most thoughtless action in modern history."

James Webb, a hero in Vietnam and President Reagan's Secretary of the Navy, wrote: "The issue before us is not whether the United States should end the regime of Saddam Hussein, but whether we as a nation are prepared to occupy territory in the Middle East for the next 30 to 50 years."

It is a traditional conservative position to be against huge deficit spending.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that a very short war followed by a five-year occupation of Iraq would cost the U.S. \$272 billion, this on top of an estimated \$350 billion deficit for the coming fiscal year.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against the U.S. being the policeman of the world. That is exactly what we will be doing if we go to war in Iraq.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against world government, because conservatives believe that government is less wasteful and arrogant when it is small and closer to the people.

It is a traditional conservative position to be critical of, skeptical about, even opposed to the very wasteful, corrupt United Nations, yet the primary justification for this war, what we hear over and over again, is that Iraq has violated 16 U.N. resolutions.

Well, other nations have violated U.N. resolutions, yet we have not threatened war against them.

It is a traditional conservative position to believe it is unfair to U.S. taxpayers and our military to put almost the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on the U.S., yet that is exactly what will happen in a war against Iraq.

In fact, it is already happening, because even if Hussein backs down now it will cost us billions of dollars in war preparations and moving so many of our troops, planes, ships, and equipment to the Middle East.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against huge foreign aid, which has been almost a complete failure for many years now.

Talk about huge foreign aid—Turkey is demanding \$26 to \$32 billion according to most reports. Israel wants \$12 to \$15 billion additional aid. Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia want additional aid in unspecified amounts.

Almost every country that is supporting the U.S. in this war effort wants something in return. The cost of all these requests have not been added in to most of the war cost calculations.

All this to fight a bad man who has a total military budget of about \$1.4 billion, less than $\frac{3}{40}$ of one percent of ours.

The White House said Hussein has less than 40% of the weaponry and manpower that he had at the time of the first Gulf War. One analyst estimated only about 20%.

His troops surrendered then to camera crews or even in one case to an empty tank. Hussein has been weakened further by years of bombing and economic sanctions and embargos.

He is an evil man, but he is no threat to us, and if this war comes about, it will probably be one of the shortest and certainly one of the most lopsided wars in history.

Our own CIA put out a report just a few days before our War Resolution vote saying

that Hussein was so weak economically and militarily he was really not capable of attacking anyone unless forced into it. He really controls very little outside the city of Baghdad.

The Washington Post, two days ago, had a column by Al Kamen which said: "The war in Iraq, likely in the next few weeks, is not expected to last long, given the overwhelming U.S. firepower to be arrayed against the Iraqis. But the trickier job may be in the aftermath, when Washington plans to install an administrator, or viceroy, who would direct post-war reconstruction of the place."

Fortune Magazine said: "Iraq—We win. What then?" "A military victory could turn into a strategic defeat. . . . A prolonged, expensive, American-led occupation . . . could turn U.S. troops into sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists. . . . All of that could have immediate and negative consequences for the global economy."

Not only have most conservative columnists come out strongly against this war, but also at least four conservative magazines and two conservative think tanks.

One conservative Republican member of the other Body (Sen. HAGEL) said last week that the "rush to war in Iraq could backfire" and asked: "We are wrecking coalitions, relationships and alliances so we can get a two-week start on going to war alone?"

The Atlantic Monthly Magazine said we would spend so much money in Iraq we might as well make it the 51st state. I believe most conservatives would rather that money be spent here instead of 7,000 miles away.

It is a traditional conservative position to be in favor of a strong national defense, not one that turns our soldiers into international social workers, and to believe in a noninterventionist foreign policy rather than in globalism or internationalism.

We should be friends with all nations, but we will weaken our own nation, maybe irreversibly unless we follow the more humble foreign policy the President advocated in his campaign.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is very much against every conservative tradition to support preemptive war.

Another member of the other Body, the Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, not a conservative but certainly one with great knowledge of and respect for history and tradition said recently:

"This is no simple attempt to defang a villain. No. This coming battle, if it materializes, represents a turning point in U.S. foreign policy and possibly a turning point in the recent history of the world. This nation is about to embark upon the first test of the revolutionary doctrine applied in an extraordinary way at an unfortunate time. The doctrine of preemption—the idea that the United States or any other nation can legitimately attack a nation that is not imminently threatening but may be threatening in the future—is a radical new twist on the traditional idea of self-defense."

The columnist William Raspberry, again not a conservative but one who sometimes takes conservative positions, wrote this week these words: "Why so fast. Because Hussein will stall the same way he's been stalling for a dozen years. A dozen years, by the way, during which he has attacked no one, gassed no one, launched terror attacks on no one. Tell me its because of American pressure that he has stayed his hand, and I say great. Isn't that

better than a U.S.-launched war guaranteed to engender massive slaughter and spread terrorism?"

Throughout these remarks, I have said not one word critical of the President or any of his advisors or anyone on the other side of this issue.

I especially have not and will not criticize the fine men and women in our Nation's armed forces. They are simply following orders and attempting to serve this country in an honorable way.

Conservatives are generally not the types who participate in street demonstrations, especially ones led by people who say mean-spirited things about our President. But I do sincerely believe the true conservative position, the traditional conservative position is against this war.

FOUR KEYS TO CONTEXTUALIZE THE BUSH BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this body and for our President to level with the people of the United States of America. Just a couple of years ago when people ran for office, we were all talking about the Social Security and Medicare lockbox. We need to be honest with the American people and say that that lockbox has been opened up. It has been turned upside down and every penny's been shaken out of it.

When we hear talk these days about the budget deficits, those deficits are masked and artificially lowered because we are unfortunately, once again, borrowing from Social Security and Medicare.

My colleagues will hear various talks about what the deficit is. Often times they will hear that the unified deficit is, let us say, for example, \$304 billion for next year or \$307 billion for the following year. The only way we arrive at those figures, which are admittedly very substantial, is by borrowing from Social Security and Medicare.

Were it not for that borrowing, what would the real deficits be? The real deficits for next year or for this year would be \$468 billion. For next year, they would be \$482 billion; and that is without budgeting for the cost of occupation of Iraq, nor is it for budgeting for the cost of fixing the alternative minimum tax, which this body should do.

We need to be honest. We cannot run for office 1 year and say we are going to establish a lockbox and the next year pretend that we have not opened it as we have.

Our friends on the other side are going to try to say that it is not so much deficits that matter. These, by the way, are the folks who have previously talked about a balanced budget amendment in which I think we need to balance the budget. They will say it is not deficits. It is deficits as a percentage of GDP.

The trouble with that is our own Treasury Secretary Mr. John Snow in 1995 said, and here is the quote, that a credible sustained reduction in Federal deficits will bring about major economic benefits. He was right, and he suggested that if the government spends less and borrows less from investors to cover the climbing deficits, more capital will be available for investment in the private sector of the economy. Inflationary pressure would ease and interest rates would respond by declining as much as 2 percentage points.

Today, Mr. Snow and many of his colleagues are saying it is a matter of deficits as a percentage of GDP; but when he said this in 1995, the budget deficits at that time were about where they are now as a percentage of GDP. In other words, deficits mattered in 1995. Deficits matter in the year 2003, and deficits are going to matter in the year 2013 when our kids have to pay off the debt we are creating today, and those kids are going to have to pay the debt tax.

We have heard a lot about the debt tax. The death tax is the tax on estates that are passed on to people, and it affects about two percent of the population. The debt tax, D-E-B-T, debt tax affects every member of this population from the day they are born. It is over \$4,000 a year for an average family of four and it is rising.

We need to return to fiscal responsibility. That was a concept once embraced by conservatives. I still believe it is a conservative concept. Unfortunately, it is not a concept that is shared by many erstwhile conservatives.

So what is the take-home message? The take-home message is if we are going to put Social Security and Medicare in a lockbox, we should do so and we should be honest with the American people.

Let us look again at what the deficit really is. The projection for 2004 is \$482 billion.

One final note. People will say we could solve the problem of deficits if only the Democrats or the Congress would hold down spending. There is some truth to that, but the combined nondefense discretionary spending projection for 2004 is \$429 billion. The deficit is \$482 billion. If the nondefense discretionary spending is only \$429 billion, this means we could eliminate every nondefense discretionary program, and that includes Head Start, environmental protection, agriculture, transportation, many veterans benefits, the National Institutes of Health, not hold the line on inflation, eliminate these programs and countless others entirely, eliminate law enforcement from the Federal Government to support, et cetera.

We would still then have a deficit. This deficit is not caused solely by any means by spending. It is caused to a significant degree by the exorbitant tax cuts that have been passed and the

increasing tax cuts that are proposed; and if we are going to pass those, we need to at least level with the American people and tell them what the true costs are today and the true costs are in the future.

FOUR KEYS TO CONTEXTUALIZE THE BUSH BUDGET

The "On-Budget" Deficit projections for the next five years are listed below along with the corresponding figures for the Projected Non-defense Discretionary Outlays.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
On-budget deficit	-468	-482	-407	-412	-406
Non-defense discretionary spending	416	429	440	447	455
Net if all non-defense outlays were eliminated	-52	-53	+33	+35	+49

Numbers in \$billions, not including any projections for costs of Iraq war and occupation or adjustments to fix the AMT.
Source: Table S-2, page 312 OMB Budget.

KEY POINTS

1. Democrats should only refer to "On-Budget Deficits" and not let Republicans mask the true deficit by borrowing from Social Security and Medicare. The President, most Republicans in Congress, and many members of our own caucus were elected based on the "lockbox" pledge. If those pledges were honored, the deficits, as shown above, are far higher than the Administration or Republican Members of Congress acknowledge.

2. When Republicans say we could achieve balance if only Democrats would limit spending, they are lying. As the chart shows, even if all non-defense spending were completely eliminated, not simply reduced slightly, we would still face on budget deficits. Furthermore, the on-budget deficits in the chart above are based on Republican revenue and spending proposals. If the Republicans truly wanted to reduce deficits, they could make the cuts or increase revenues, but they have refused to do so and instead prefer to borrow from Social Security and Medicare to mask their policies.

3. The Republican dodge of expressing deficits as a percentage of GDP is clearly a ruse because the newly appointed Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow, vigorously called for deficit reductions in 1995, a time when deficits as a percentage of GDP were almost identical to levels projected for 2003. Republicans may counter this argument by saying the projections at that time showed a widening deficit problem over the projected 5 years and the Administration's current deficit projections are shrinking. However, the Administration's present budget forecast includes no cost for a war in Iraq, no AMT fix and rosy growth forecasts. These costs will certainly add significantly to the growing deficit over the next 5 years.

4. The consequence of such borrowing to pay for the Republican tax cuts for the wealthy is an increase in the "Debt Tax". Simply put, the "Debt Tax" is the average amount every American must pay each year simply to service the interest on the national debt. The difference between the "Death Tax" which the Republicans want to repeal, and the "Debt Tax" which they are covertly increasing, is that the former only affects the wealthiest two percent of our citizens when they die. By comparison, the "Debt Tax" confronts every single American from the moment they are born and for the rest of their lives until we pay down the debt.